

study towards a master's degree in theology. His career goal is community service. He wants to work to make life better for the less fortunate of our brothers and sisters.

The accumulation of material goods has never been an objective for Ted. He worked hard on construction jobs and other jobs to earn his way through college and last year, to help pay his graduate school cost, Ted worked at a summer youth job program funded by one of the programs the Republicans propose to cut or eliminate with their cuts last week and those yet to come.

I want to take a close look at this program. He worked with 160 disadvantaged young people, 40 special ed children with learning and developmental disabilities, providing them with academic enrichment and physical development help. He also worked with another group of 120 kids who test below a grade level, are out of school and out of work. His job, teach them how to fill out job applications, how to interview on the phone and in person for jobs, and work with them to improve their basic academic skills.

If the Republican cuts prevail, there are going to be 161 losers this summer. The next group of 160 kids and Ted.

Society will be victimized because these young people will be denied an opportunity to become productive members of our economy.

By the way, Ted's wife Julie, who teaches children with learning disabilities, was planning to do her masters thesis on this project to demonstrate how such a program can be a model curriculum for special ed student's enrichment and move them to jobs and work.

I raise this personal story because I think it is important to put flesh and blood on the statistics we deal with, to put a face on the numbers and to translate the issues into tangible reality. And sometimes that reality hurts personally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska, [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BEREUTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TEENAGE PREGNANCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, throughout the welfare debate we have argued about just about everything. And when I came in tonight and heard a little bit of discussion about religion, I realized just about how far crazy it had gone.

We have argued about how much the school lunch program is supposed to go up, at least it is going up, and we have argued over whether Federal programs work better than the local ones. But

we are not talking about cutting them out, just who controls them.

We have even argued about who understands compassion better. But if there is one thing that we have agreed on, without exception, is the fact that our welfare system is failing. The intent of the system was always a noble one, because Americans are kind, loving, noble people. And it was to help those people that were down get back up on their feet and become independent and help those that could not help themselves because of severe handicaps or they were too young until they did not need help any longer.

And for awhile, that is what it was. But then like so many other government bureaucracies, it began to grow. People started taking advantage of it and using it, a practice that has hurt taxpayers. But I want to tell you something, if it only hurt taxpayers, it would not be so bad. But you know, welfare has spawned a social disease that is suddenly destroying our society. And that social disease is illegitimacy. It is babies being born without daddies.

Today the number of illegitimate births in our country is 30 percent. In some major towns, it is 50 percent. That means that we have a major, major problem in our society.

Now, this would not be too bad if it were not that we could look to the inner cities and see that it is worse. Inner city poor, there are 80 percent born out of a married family in the black inner city poor neighborhoods.

It is interesting that we have been so compassionate as some of us were marching liberals in the 1960s that we said it did not make any difference if a baby was born out of wedlock. But I want to stand here tonight and tell you that I was wrong when I was a marching liberal in the 1960s with long ironed hair, because now we see what has happened in this society. We see little girls having babies in their own apartments, where older guys are fathering, not teenagers, folks, they are fathering half of those children, a moral decay, a loss of life for those young teenagers.

But what I want to talk about briefly is those children that we are talking about being so compassionate to as we fight to keep their mothers in poverty by giving them welfare when they are teenagers.

Do you know that these little girls that are born are three times as likely to be little girls that become teenage girls that also go on welfare and have babies when they are still babies?

Did you know these little boys are multi-times, depending on the cities, more likely to go into gangs if they do not of a mommy and daddy at both home? Do you also know that they are born weaker, lower birth weight? Do you know that?

I think that that is what we are addressing with this welfare reform. We are talking about a new world that says no to the liberal 1960s and some of us are going to stand here and we are

going to apologize for what we did when we thought telling those young girls yes was okay. We are going to say, we know that was wrong, that the most compassionate thing we can do for these little kids and their kids is to not give them cash grants, to not go on and reward the wrong decisions, to not reward sometimes their mothers who encourage them in some tenement house to go get pregnant so they can get the welfare that they have learned to live on.

The Republican welfare bill does some wonderful things that we can see in the future and be proud of. It says we will take care of these kids and that we will make sure we take care of their babies but we will not lock them into poverty.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. WYNN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SCHOOL LUNCH CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight to remind our colleagues and the American people that what we are really talking about tonight in this so-called welfare reform debate, what we are really talking about is really politics. And it is really the politics of the rich and the poor.

Some of you may remember that book, the Politics of the Rich and Poor. It was written by Kevin Phillips. He was President Reagan's economic advisor.

And this politics of the rich and poor that we are talking about tonight goes against children, the nutrition program. The savings that you hear so much tonight that is going to come forth from the Republican proposal is not going for the deficit. It is not going to reduce the debt. It is going to go to the tax breaks in two weeks on this floor for the big corporations and for the wealthiest of this country. So let us talk about little bit about the poor.

The poor tonight are the people in Michigan, the working folks who are sending their kids to school. And after this bill goes through tomorrow, and it will go through because they have more votes than we do, 7,100 children in Michigan will be denied the nutrition program. Michigan will lose \$1.5 million for nutrition programs. These are the poor in Michigan who will lose tomorrow afternoon underneath the nutrition program.

But who will win? Who is going to win in this whole program? AFDC. I do not mean Aid for Dependent Children. I mean aid for dependent corporations, the rich. If you look at it, in the fiscal